



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,733	04/25/2001	Michael C. Berry	53087-5004	6535
28977	7590	02/22/2005	EXAMINER	
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP			BAUM, RONALD	
1701 MARKET STREET			ART UNIT	
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2921			PAPER NUMBER	

2136

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/841,733

Applicant(s)

BERRY ET AL

Examiner

Ronald Baum

Art Unit

2136

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12, 14 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12, 14 and 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/12/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2136

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in reply to applicant's correspondence of 12 October 2004.
2. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, 14, 17 are pending for examination.
3. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-12, 14 and 17 remain rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3,5-9,11-12,14,17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lamming et al, U.S. Patent 6,144,997.

5. As per claim 1; "A method for managing access to a service [Abstract, figure 1 and associated description, col. 1,line 16-col. 2,line 57] comprising the steps of

(A) delegating, to a delegatee by a delegator, over at least one ad hoc network in a personal area network, one or more permissions,

wherein the one or more permissions comprise authority

to access the service and

to delegate one or more further permissions to one or more subsequent

delegatees and

Art Unit: 2136

wherein the one or more permissions are represented using a digital signature [col. 2, lines 6-57, col. 3, lines 36-58, col. 4, lines 43-66, col. 5, lines 45-col. 6, line 11, col. 6, lines 41-51, col. 7, lines 51-62, col. 8, lines 23-col. 9, line 29 (inclusive of “Mike and Richard” scenarios), col. 9, lines 66-col. 10, line 26, col. 10, lines 49-65, col. 11, lines 6-24, figures 1,4,5 and associated descriptions];

(B) receiving from at least one of said permitted delegates data representing credential information relating to said one or more permissions via a credential transmission mechanism over a second computer network that is different from the at least one personal area network [col. 7, lines 51-62, col. 8, lines 23-60 (“Mike and Richard” scenarios), col. 10, lines 43-col. 12, line 57, figures 1,4,5 and associated descriptions]; and

(C) providing access to the service to at least one of said permitted delegates over said second computer network [figures 1,4,5 and associated descriptions].”;

Further, as per claim 7; this claim is the system claim for the method claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection.

6. Claim 2 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; “The method of claim 1

wherein said credential transmission mechanism comprises including said data in a header of an http request for a web page.”.

The teachings of Lamming et al suggest such limitations (col. 4, lines 43-col. 5, line 17, col. 8, lines 23-col. 9, line 29 (inclusive of “Mike and Richard” scenarios));

Art Unit: 2136

Further, as per claim 8; this claim is the system claim for the method claim 2 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 2 rejection.

7. Claim 3 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said credential transmission mechanism comprises including said data in a URL.”.

The teachings of Lamming et al suggest such limitations (col. 4, lines 43-col. 5, line 17, col. 8, lines 23-col. 9, line 29 (inclusive of “Mike and Richard” scenarios));

Further, as per claim 9; this claim is the system claim for the method claim 3 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 3 rejection.

8. Claim 5 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said personal area network comprises two or more devices that transmit data by infrared light waves.”.

The teachings of Lamming et al suggest such limitations (Abstract, figure 1 and associated description);

Further, as per claim 11; this claim is the system claim for the method claim 5 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 5 rejection.

9. Claim 6 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said personal area network comprises two or more devices that transmit data by digital short-range radio waves.”.

Art Unit: 2136

The teachings of Lamming et al suggest such limitations (col. 5, lines 30-44, col. 11, lines 25-col. 12, line 57);

Further, as per claim 12; this claim is the system claim for the method claim 6 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 6 rejection.

10. As per claim 14; "A method for managing access to a service [Abstract, figure 1 and associated description, col. 1, line 16-col. 2, line 57] comprising the steps of

(A) delegating, to a delegatee by a delegator, one or more permissions, wherein the one or more permissions comprise authority

to access the service and

to delegate one or more further permissions to one or more subsequent delegates

and

wherein the one or more permissions are represented using a digital signature based on a private key [col. 2, lines 6-57, col. 3, lines 36-58, col. 4, lines 43-col. 5, line 17, col. 5, lines 45-col. 6, line 11, col. 6, lines 41-51, col. 7, lines 51-62, col. 8, lines 23-col. 9, line 29 (inclusive of "Mike and Richard" scenarios), col. 9, lines 66-col. 10, line 26, col. 10, lines 49-65, col. 11, lines 6-24, figures 1, 4, 5 and associated descriptions];

(B) receiving from at least one of said permitted delegates data representing credential information relating to said one or more permissions,

wherein said data is included in a URL, over a second computer network [col. 7, lines 51-62, col. 8, lines 23-60 ("Mike and Richard" scenarios), figures 1, 4, 5 and associated descriptions]; and (C) providing access to the service to at least one of said permitted

Art Unit: 2136

delegates over said second computer network [figures 1,4,5 and associated descriptions].”;

Further, as per claim 17; this claim is the system claim for the method claim 14 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 14 rejection.

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Ronald Baum, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3861, and whose unofficial Fax number is (571) 273-3861. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2136

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached at (571) 272-3795. The Fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Ronald Baum

Patent Examiner


GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100